

REMARKS

Claims 12-16 and 21-23 are now pending in the application. Claim 12 has been amended. Claims 21-23 have been added. Claim 12 is independent.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,223,800 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to claim 12, Applicants assert that Kim et al. fail to disclose an inspection unit configurable to inspect a status and a position of land patterns on a mount tape during movement of the mount tape for bonding. Instead, Kim et al. disclose a camera located over a pumping device for monitoring a nozzle so as to allow an Ag epoxy to be ejected to a precise application site in a lead frame (col. 3, lines 23-26); the lead frame being temporarily fixed to an Ag epoxy application table (col. 3, lines 17-21). Applicants assert that a camera that monitors a nozzle while a lead frame is temporarily fixed as disclosed in Kim et al. is not the same as an inspection unit configurable to inspect a status and a position of land patterns on a mount tape during movement of the mount tape for bonding as recited in claim 12. For at least this reason, Applicants assert that Kim et al. fail to disclose each and every element of claim 12 and claim 12 is, therefore, allowable. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) rejection of claim 12 be withdrawn.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jin et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,765,277). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to claim 12, Applicants assert that Jin et al. fail to disclose an inspection unit configurable to inspect a status and a position of land patterns on a

mount tape during movement of the mount tape for bonding. Instead, Jin et al., with reference to Figs. 4 and 5, disclose a camera 46 that confirms a location of a chip 47. After the chip 47 is confirmed, the chip 47 is moved under a bond head 43 which then bonds the chip 47 to a lead frame 45 (Col. 2, lines 16-25). Applicants assert that a camera 46 that confirms a chip 47 location, the chip 47 later being bonded to a lead frame 45, as disclosed in Jin et al. is not the same as an inspection unit configurable to inspect a status and a position of land patterns on a mount tape during movement of the mount tape for bonding as recited in claim 12. For at least this reason, Applicants assert that Jin et al. fail to disclose each and every element of claim 12 and claim 12 is, therefore, allowable. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) rejection of claim 12 be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. or Jin et al., as applied to claim 12, and further in view of Kim et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,838,061). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As disclosed above, neither Kim et al. or Jin et al. disclose an inspection unit configurable to inspect a status and a position of land patterns on a mount tape during movement of the mount tape for bonding as recited in claim 12.

Kim '061 is directed to a method of making a semiconductor package bonded to a semiconductor chip. Kim '061 is also silent as to an inspection unit configurable to inspect a status and a position of land patterns on a mount tape during movement of the mount tape for bonding as recited in claim 12. Instead, Kim '061 discloses a CCD camera that is used in aligning and arranging a semiconductor chip (Col. 4, lines 1-20).

Therefore, Kim '061 can not disclose or suggest an inspection unit as recited in claim 12. Claim 12 is not rendered obvious to one skilled in the art by Kim et al. in view of Jin et al. and in further view of Kim '061. Claim 13 is allowable at least because it depends from independent claim 12.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 14-16 are allowable. Applicants have not put claims 14-16 into independent form because they depend from independent claim 12 which Applicants believe have been shown to be allowable.

New Claims

Further, Applicants have added new claims 21-23 which, based upon the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance, should also be allowable.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John A. Castellano at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By



John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

JAC/RFS:ewd